From: Kissinger.Lon@epamail.epa.gov

To: Asher, Chance (ECY); Hankins, Martha (ECY); cmcc461@ecy.wa.gov; dbra461@ecy.wa.gov;

pkme461@ecy.wa.gov

Cc: Hiltner.Allison@epamail.epa.gov; Sanga.Ravi@epamail.epa.gov; Peterson.Piper@epamail.epa.gov;

keeley.karen@epa.gov; Harney.Nancy@epamail.epa.gov; Brincefield.Timothy@epamail.epa.gov; Hoffman.Erika@epamail.epa.gov; Fleming.Sheila@epamail.epa.gov; Bailey.Marcia@epamail.epa.gov; Stifelman.Marc@epamail.epa.gov; Nwosu.Julius@epamail.epa.gov; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Szelag.Matthew@epamail.epa.gov; Chung.Angela@epamail.epa.gov; Dagseth.Renee@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: Lon"s Comments on Ecology"s draft sediment management standards

Date: Monday, October 29, 2012 4:24:38 PM

Attachments: <u>Draft SMS Rule Amendments Comment Form Lon Kissinger.docx</u>

Hi,

Attached are my comments on Ecology's proposed sediment management rule amendments.

Please note that though I have reviewed the draft SMS revisions as an EPA Region 10 employee, my comments represent my personal opinions about the rule and my personal take on how EPA regional and national considerations impact the rule. I have not attempted to circulate my comments to other EPA staff members to obtain a consensus EPA regional opinion, and it is possible that other EPA staff might have opinions that differ from my own.

I have circulated the rule and my comments to other EPA Region 10 staff to elicit their opinions on the freshwater ecological standards, public participation provisions, and sites regulated under joint MTCA/CERCLA authority.

Some general observations are as follows:

I think Ecology should consider developing an issues paper to set sediment cleanup standards for PCBs, cPAHs, arsenic, and polychlorinated dibenzo furans that consider human health. In comparing human health risk and background as the basis for cleanup standards, it is likely that the standards for these major sediment site contaminants will be based on background. Having default standards for these contaminants would considerably simplify evaluating cleanups.

Detailed material on important topics (e.g. determination of background and comparison of background and site concentrations, assessment of compliance with CSLs) is not provided in the rule. Ecology has revised its sediment cleanup users manual to incorporate some guidance. It is my opinion that Ecology should have put out the rule and available guidance together for joint consideration. If complete guidance is not available, at a minimum, Ecology should outline the contents of guidance and provide a time line for developing guidance. NOTE: I WILL BE PROVIDING COMMENTS ON ECOLOGY'S CURRENT SEDIMENT HHRA GUIDANCE UNDER SEPARATE COVER.

The reliance on the three station approach used for benthic invertebrate SMS evaluation does not translate well to evaluation of human health risks which is based on the areas receptors traverse.

Use of site area to fish home range ratios and sustainability considerations are not appropriate for assessment of human health risks as they can substantially underestimate risk.

The suggested contents of the RI and FS reports do not provide all the information that is really needed for site evaluation, comparison of cleanup alternatives, and selection of a cleanup action.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

(See attached file: Draft SMS Rule Amendments Comment Form Lon Kissinger.docx)

Regards,

Lon Kissinger
Toxicologist
Office of Environmental Assessment, Risk Evaluation Unit
U.S. EPA - Region 10, Suite 900
Mail Stop: OEA-095
1200 6th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98101

kissinger.lon@epa.gov

206-553-2115 voice 206-553-0119 FAX